

Remarks

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Keilman et al. (US 6,231,516).

Claims 3, 8 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(c) as being unpatentable over Keilman et al.

Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(c) as being unpatentable over Keilman et al. in view of Wilk (US 6,319,201).

Claims 1-13 remain in the application unamended.

Claim 1 is directed to a transmission cable, for use in a magnetic resonance apparatus, the transmission cable comprising: a plurality of cable segments; and a plurality of electroacoustic couplers for providing electrical connection between segments.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action states that Keilman et al. discloses a transmission cable, for use in magnetic resonance apparatus, the transmission cable comprising (Figures 19A-19D): a plurality of cable segments (RF coil segments #223A); and a plurality of electroacoustic couplers for providing electrical connection between segments (ultrasonic and electrical transducer sensor #220).

A look to Keilman, however, indicates that Keilman teaches that FIG. 19A is an isometric view of an implantable integrated circuit (IC) transducer 220 mounted on a tubular stent 222, which may comprise a stent similar to that described in conjunction with FIG. 11A above. Wires form a RF coupling coil 223 coupled to the implantable IC sensor 220 via wires 225. See Keilman, et al. column 28, lines 6-11.

In light of the teachings of Keilman et al., Applicants respectfully submit that Keilman does not teach or suggest a plurality of electroacoustic couplers for providing electrical connection between segments as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 6 is directed to an MR apparatus comprising: a first magnet system for generating a main magnetic field in an examination region; an RF coil disposed in the examination region for transmitting and/or receiving RF signals to and/or from the examination region; and a plurality of transmission cables for carrying signals with the MR

system, at least one of the transmission cables comprising a plurality of cable segments and a plurality of electroacoustic couplers for coupling adjacent cable segments.

First, the foregoing remarks with respect to the patentability of claim 1 can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to claim 6.

Second, in rejecting claim 6, the Office Action states that at column 38, lines 29-32 Keilman et al. teaches an MR apparatus comprising a first magnet system for generating a main magnetic field in an examination region. However, a look to this references indicates that this portion of Keilman et al. teaches Referring again to FIG. 25, in another embodiment, a permanent magnet 311 may be included on or in the stent 310 to provide a static magnetic field for localization of magnetic delivery vehicles. An oscillating magnetic field may then be provided via signals supplied to the coil 312 to rupture the delivery vehicles under the control of the implantable electronic circuit of any of FIGS. 1 through 6, where the coil 312 acts as one of the transducers 44-46. In light of the teachings of Keilman et al. Applicants respectfully submit that Keilman et al. does not teach or suggest a first magnet system for generating a main magnetic field in an examination region as set forth in claim 6.

Claim 11 is directed to a transmission cable for use in a magnetic resonance apparatus, the transmission cable comprising: a plurality of cable segments; and a plurality of couplers each of which transforms a first signal carried by a first cable segment into an acoustic signal and from the acoustic signal into a second signal carried by a second cable segment.

The foregoing remarks with respect to the patentability of claim 1 can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to claim 11. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 are respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 6, or 11. For at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claims 1, 6, and 11, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-13 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-13 distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

If any fees are due in connection with this Response A, the authorization to charge deposit account 14-1270 for the fees associated therewith is hereby provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Lundin
Reg. No. 48,979
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
T: 440-483-4281
F: 440-483-2452

34374.1